



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,590	10/01/2003	Sig Harold Badt JR.	139161	7975
24587	7590	11/08/2007	EXAMINER	
ALCATEL LUCENT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS 3400 W. PLANO PARKWAY, MS LEGL2 PLANO, TX 75075			HERNANDEZ, JOSIAH J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2626		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/08/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/676,590	BADT, SIG HAROLD
Examiner Josiah Hernandez	Examiner	Art Unit
		2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 10/01/2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 08/30/2007 have been fully considered and after revision of the remarks received the arguments are considered to be non-persuasive.

The remarks claim that the prior art reference does not teach prompting a user at specific point in a dialog for expected inputs according to a specified grammar. It is also stated that the reference does not teach specifically prompting the user to speak information and that no dialog b/w the user and computer exist in the system. Finally, it is stated that what is new in the invention is that a user does not always know what is the acceptable lexicon (dictionary) and grammar at each point of a dialog and prompting is provided with expected grammar.

Although the remarks have been considered and understood to its entirety, the claim language used in its limitations state a vague interpretation of the above remarks and can be interpreted to be taught by Wang et al. (US PGPUB 2002/0165719) and many more prior art references with similar limitations.

According to the claim language the independent claims state a system and apparatus that uses a computer interface system (such as a GUI) with a microphone and voice recognition system, Wherein the GUI "prompts" (by using the term "prompt", it can be interpreted as advising or guiding) a user at some point in the dialog (at any window, transaction interface, or any point where a user is accomplishing a function

Art Unit: 2626

with the computer through voice recognition) for expected inputs that the user can speak or say (there is no indication as to how the expected inputs are to be prompted, indicated/used for guidance, it could be through a drop box, or pop-up window or anything that guides/alerts/prompts the user of when to speak and what words to speak. Finally the claim language states that the prompts "*may*" specify the type of expected input and words that are recognized by the system (the claim interpretation that is invoked by the use of such language as "*may*" is that of uncertainty of an actual processes taking place and therefore not resulting in a sure or predictable tangible result, the statement indicates that it may occur and that it is not certain that it will always occur).

In light of the above paragraph, it would be obvious to use the prior art reference of Wang et al. (US PGPUB 2002/0165719). Considering a more specific example of paragraphs [0054]-[0056], it becomes clear as to how Wang teaches the limitations of the claims. In the paragraphs stated above a GUI is used for a dialog between a user and the computing system for an application such as a credit card transaction (of which would be "a certain point in the dialog process" just as accepting credit card information would be another). The user can input the credit card information by speech recognition. In order to prevent confusion as to what grammar is expected the GUI provides an interface with textboxes and dropdown boxes with the options available to the user (therefore serving as a prompt/guidance for alerting the user as to what grammar/words are acceptable). In paragraph [0080] it further describes accepting

grammar by the recognition system and recognition system associating fields with the grammar for grammar recognition.

If the claim language would be more specific as to the method of prompting the user of expected grammar/words such as a pop-up windows or drop box with a list of potential grammars, for example, the claim limitation would then be more specific as to what invention the applicant is actually trying to patent, otherwise the claim language is vague and many prior art references can be used to teach such a broad concept.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Wang et al. (US PGPub 2002/0165719).

As to claim 1, Wang discloses a computer interface system (see paragraphs [0027] lines 1-6), comprising: a microphone that receives audio input from a user (see paragraph [0008] lines 3-5); a voice recognition mechanism (see paragraphs [0018]); and a graphical user interface that prompts the user for expected inputs that the user can speak at designated points in a dialog (see paragraph [0010] lines 3-7) according to a specified grammar (see paragraphs [0008] lines 7-9); wherein prompts may specify the type of expected input (drop down boxes are used in the GUI to indicate expected values, see figure 1); wherein prompts may specify words that are recognized by the system (see paragraph [0008] lines 7-9).

As to claim 8, Wang discloses a computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a computer interface system (see paragraph [0027]), the computer program product comprising: first instructions for receiving audio input from a user (see paragraph [0008] lines 3-5); second instructions for automatic voice recognition (see paragraphs [0018]); and third instructions for displaying a graphical user interface that prompts the user for expected inputs that the user can speak at designated points in a dialog (see paragraph [0010] lines 3-7) according to a specified grammar (see paragraphs [0008] lines 7-9); wherein prompts may specify the type of expected input (drop down boxes are used in the GUI to indicate expected values, see figure 1); wherein prompts may

specify words that are recognized by the system (see paragraph [0008] lines 7-9).

As to claim 15, Wang discloses a method for interfacing between a computer and a human user (see abstract line 2), the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of: receiving audio input from the user (see paragraph [0008] lines 3-5); interpreting the audio input via voice recognition (see paragraphs [0018]); and displaying a graphical user interface that prompts the user for expected inputs that the user can speak at designated points in a dialog (see paragraph [0010] lines 3-7) according to a specified grammar (see paragraphs [0008] lines 7-9); wherein prompts may specify the type of expected input (drop down boxes are used in the GUI to indicate expected values, see figure 1); wherein prompts may specify words that are recognized by the system (see paragraph [0008] lines 7-9).

As to claims 2, 9, and 16, Wang discloses a multi-modal input system wherein prompts that represent non-terminal tokens in the grammar are replaced with one of a set of other prompts in the grammar in response to the spoken input (see paragraph [0082] lines 1-7).

As to claims 4, 11, and 18, Wang discloses said system with at least one speaker that provides audio prompts for expected inputs (see paragraph [0064] lines 7-11).

As to claims 6, 13, and 20, Wang discloses said system with a graphical user interface that further comprises a pull-down menu (see figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US PGPub 2002/0165719) in view of Katsuranis (US PGPub 2005/0021336).

As to claims 5, 12, and 19, Wang does not specifically disclose a multi-modal input system that the prompt may further comprise a second graphical user interface window. Katsuranis teaches a multi-modal input system that displays and controls the content of a second graphical application window while in a first graphical application window in a windowed computing environment having a voice recognition engine (see abstract lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the multi-modal input system of Wang with the feature of the first and second graphical user interface window as taught by Katsuranis. Doing so would have allowed a user using the system to be able to organize the graphical window he or she is working with and eliminate the frustration of having to toggle through numerous windows just to refer from one window to the other (see paragraphs [0004], [0005], [0033]).

As to claims 7, 14, and 21, Wang does not specifically disclose a multi-modal input system that comprises a set of reserved words that activate specified prompts when spoken by the user. Katsuranis teaches using key word commands to open, view, retrieve, and much more (see abstract lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the multi-modal input system of Wang with the features of a set of key word

commands as taught by Katsuranis. Doing so gives the system key words that are not necessarily a non-terminal command but are intended to facilitate the navigation and experience of the user.

5. Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (US PGPub 2002/0165719) in view of Katsuranis (US PGPub 2005/0021336) as applied to claims 1, 8, and 15 and in further view of Dantzig et al. (US PGPub 2003/0071833).

As to claims 3, 10, and 17, Wang discloses a multi-modal input system wherein the graphical user interface is built automatically from a single grammar specification (image grammars can be used to have visual representation of voice recognition thus making it automatic, see paragraph [0064] lines 1-6).

Wang or Katsuranis do not disclose using a dictionary for the creation of the graphical user interface. Dantzig teaches creating a multimodal interface with GUI and speech recognition (see abstract). In the GUI a dictionary is use for construction of the interface (see paragraph [0092] lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the multi-modal input system of Wang and Katsurani with the features of a dictionary as taught by Dantzig. Doing so would allow for addition of new grammars

with out have to constantly add new meanings to the database of the system.

Conclusion

A note has been made to notify the appropriate parties that the examiner has moved from Art Unit 2609 to 2626.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Josiah Hernandez whose telephone number is 571-270-1646. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:30 pm to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JH


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2610